DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 318 UD 034 099

TITLE	Summer School 2000 Status Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Div. of Assessment and Acccuntability.
PUB DATE	2000-08-23
NOTE	14p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York City Board of Education, Division of Assessment and Accountability, 110 Livingston Street, Room 728, Brooklyn, NY 11201. For full text: http://www.nycenet.edu.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Grade Repetition; Mathematics Achievement; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Reading Achievement; Student Evaluation; *Summer Schools; Tables (Data); Teacher Recruitment; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This report provides information on the status of summer schools in New York City in 2000. The report describes: (1) "Planning and Management"; (2) "Student Information" (319,167 students were preregistered for summer school, and 87.9 percent of mandated students attended, compared to 64.4 percent the year before); (3) "Assessment Outcomes and Promotion Decisions" (42,383 students grades 3-8 were tested in reading and/or math and 39,652 were promoted); (4) "Plans for Retained Students" (the Eight Plus Program for 8th graders who did not meet promotion standards and actions by community school districts and high school superintendents); (5) "Staffing" (more teachers worked in this summer program, and principals had greater direct oversight over summer schools); (6) "Operational Support" (facilities, food services, and transportation); (7) "Private Providers" (46 vendors received contracts to provide professional development, programs to increase parental involvement, direct services to students, curriculum/instructional materials, and test preparation for examinations); (8) "New York City Teaching Fellows" (part of a recruitment initiative to secure prospective teachers); (9) "Summer in the City" (also part of a recruitment initiative to secure prospective teachers); (10) "Break-Aways" (partnering schools with camps, with teachers overseeing instructional components); (11) "Program Evaluation"; and (12) "Conclusion." (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 451 318

New York City Board of Education

Summer School 2000

Status Report

August 23, 2000

UD034099

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

R. Tobias
New York City Board of Ed. - DAA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

I. Planning and Management 1
II. Student Information 3
III. Assessment Outcomes and Promotion Decisions 3
IV. Plans for Retained Students 6
V. Staffing 7
VI. Operational Support 8
VII. Private Providers 8
VIII. New York City Teaching Fellows 9
IX. Summer in the City 9
X. Break-aways 10
XI. Program Evaluation 10
XII. Conclusion 10

I. Planning and Management

In support of the Board's student promotion policy, we conducted the largest and most extensive summer program in the history of this school system. Comprehensive planning throughout the school year resulted in well-coordinated instructional and operational efforts across the entire school system. A chronology of critical planning and management events follows. These have been detailed in reports to the Board on January 14th, May 3rd, May 17th, July 11th, and August 11th.

September 1999

- Board adopts new Promotion Policy.

October 1999

- Chancellor Crew issues a Chancellor's Regulation entitled "Promotion Standards."
- Promotion Policy task force is convened. Representatives from every central division/office responsible for any aspect of summer school meet weekly throughout the year.

November 1999

- Districts appoint promotion policy liaisons and summer school liaisons to work with central staff.

December 1999

- Division of School Facilities provides the SCA and DDC with a list of **700** schools to be surveyed for air-conditioning capacity.

January 2000

- The Division of Instructional and Information Technology (DIIT) develops and implements an automated student information system for Summer School 2000. This system runs on ATS and allows for the electronic tracking of student registration and daily attendance for mandated and non-mandated programs and for public and non-public school students.
- Letters sent to parents of children whose promotion is in doubt.

February 2000

- Superintendents receive summer allocation in early February.
- Program model disseminated to Community School Districts and High school Superintendencies.
- Monitoring of promotion-in-doubt communications to parents and academic and attendance interventions in schools.
- Chancellor designates Chief of Staff, Lynne Savage, to oversee planning for summer school 2000 and to conduct on-site reviews of each district's plans.

- Chancellor appoints a Summer Program Board, consisting of one high school and five community school district superintendents to serve as an oversight group with responsibility for the planning and implementation of the program.

March 2000
- District plans for summer program designs are complete.
- Teacher recruitment begins.

April 2000
- Superintendents deliver plans for summer school.
- Centrally organized personnel posting is run.
- Online teacher application process is opened.
- Vendor fair held for private providers.

May 2000
- Instructional guides delivered to schools.
- Centrally organized professional development for summer program is provided.

June 2000
- Rosters with test results delivered to districts first week of June.
- Item skills analysis completed and sent to Districts.
- Parental notification letters sent. Promotional conferences with parents held.
- Pre-registration is completed.
- District-based professional development is provided.

July 2000
- Summer program begins.
- Intensive attendance outreach from central and district offices begins.
- Attendance outreach teams confirm discharges with parents.

August 2000
- Testing 8/7-9; make-up tests 8/9
- Promotion decisions for grades 3-8 completed by 8/11.
- Schools notify parents by 8/16.
- High School Regents 8/16-17
- High School Regents results and promotion decisions to be announced.

II. Student Information

In November 1999, staff projected that the number of students who would potentially have to attend Summer School 2000 was **321,816**. These projections included mandated, enrichment and non-public school students, and represented a "worst case scenario."By January 31, 2000, **320,029** "Promotion -In-Doubt"letters were sent to parents. As of June 29th, **319,167** students were pre-registered for summer school. A sampling of daily registers and summer attendance was presented in the July 11th and August 11th reports to the Board. It is worth noting that this year, **87.9**% of the mandated students participated in the summer program compared to **64.4**% last year.

Participation data on mandated summer school students is presented below. Final information on high school students will be available shortly and will be presented in a subsequent report to the Board.

Mandated Register by Grade

Grade	Attended		Discharged		"No Shows"		Total
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
3	10,754	86.4	1,458	11.7	230	1.8	12,442
4	7,705	85.1	1,128	12.5	217	2.4	9,050
5	7,697	87.6	926	10.5	161	1.8	8,784
6	8,847	88.9	872	8.8	234	2.4	9,953
7	9,769	91.0	731	6.8	239	2.2	10,739
8	9,706	90.6	759	7.1	250	2.3	10,715
SPED	518	60.7	301	35.2	35	4.1	854
Total	**54,996**	**87.9**	**6,175**	**9.9**	**1,366**	**2.2**	**62,537**

III. Assessment Outcomes and Promotion Decisions

Tests were administered in grades 3-8 on the following days: August 7th (Reading and Language Assessment Battery), August 8th (Mathematics and Language Assessment Battery), and August 9th (make-up examinations). A district-based exam scanning process was employed to ensure that all examination results were available for promotion decisions to be made no later than August 11th. Schools were to notify parents of promotion decisions between August 10th and August 16th.

At the high school level, Regents exams were administered on August 16th and 17th; marking was completed in time for final grades to be entered on August 18th. In addition to the Regents exam results, we are collecting data on those students whose promotion depends upon the completion of summer courses. Information on high school students' summer progress has been transferred to UAPC, which will allow for reports to be run by the end of this week. The Division of Assessment and Accountability (DAA) will be analyzing the data provided in the UAPC reports. Additionally, the students' home schools will have access to summer results and be able to print report cards for parents. Course schedules for these students will be designed accordingly.

The outcomes and promotion decisions that follow are preliminary results subject to final analysis by DAA, confirmation with superintendents and the completion of an independent evaluation by Metis Associates. Complete information will be presented in a subsequent report to the Board and in the final evaluation by Metis Associates in October. The results of the assessments for mandated students in grades 3-8 are as follows:

Tested by Grade in Reading and/or Math

Grade	Attendees	Walk-ins	Total
	N	N	N
3	8,849	64	8,913
4	6,315	47	6,362
5	6,689	65	6,754
6	7,331	40	7,371
7	7,786	62	7,848
8	4,872	37	4,909
SPED	221	5	226
Total	**42,063**	**320**	**42,383**

Mandated Test Results by Grade

Grade	Reading: Number Tested	Reading: % At/Above Level 2	Mathematics: Number Tested	Mathematics: % At/Above Level 2
3	6,813	41.1	6,828	49.9
4	5,661	47.6	3,447	33.7
5	4,653	52.9	5,663	34.8
6	3,483	29.8	6,774	36.3
7	3,633	32.0	7,085	39.3
8	1,835	31.7	4,521	23.6
SPED	204	13.2	172	8.1
Total	**26,282**	**41.0**	**34,490**	**37.3**

Note 1: Promotion decisions are based on the multiple criteria of class work, standardized tests and attendance. The primary reason for a student's retention may not have been standardized test results, therefore, not all mandated students were required to be tested.

Note 2: Results for English Language Learners (ELLs) who are tested in English or on translated versions of the Mathematics test are included above. ELLs who are exempt from testing in English, and who were tested on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) test are excluded from these statistics. LAB outcomes for these students will be contained in a future report as part of a comprehensive discussion of outcomes for ELLs.

Note 3: In Reading, 203 students improved from Level 1 into Levels 3 and 4.
In Math, 436 students improved from Level 1 into Levels 3 and 4.

Promotion Decisions by Grade

Grade	Promoted		Retained		Decision to be Recorded in ATS		Total
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
3	6,478	52.1	5,298	42.6	666	5.4	12,442
4	5,169	57.1	3,322	36.7	559	6.2	9,050
5	5,627	64.1	2,732	31.1	425	4.8	8,784
6	6,670	67.0	2,882	29.0	401	4.0	9,953
7	7,477	69.6	3,063	28.5	199	1.9	10,739
8	7,752	72.3	2,849	26.6	114	1.1	10,715
SPED	479	56.1	262	30.7	113	13.2	854
Total	**39,652**	**63.4**	**20,408**	**32.6**	**2,477**	**4.0**	**62,537**

Note: As of August 18, 2000, 96% of the data on promotion decisions are reported here. While parents have been notified, Superintendents are continuing to enter promotion decisions for the remaining 2,477 students into the ATS system. Final statistics on promotion decisions will be contained in a subsequent report.

IV. Plans for Retained Students

A. **Community School Districts and High School Superintendencies**
In June 2000, Superintendents completed preliminary plans for students who will be retained in grade in fall. The purpose of these plans is to ensure that retained students do not simply repeat the year recycling through the same instructional program they received the previous year. Superintendents were asked to consider different settings and different supports to meet the unique needs of these students. Central staff reviewed the preliminary plans and suggested revisions. Final plans will be reviewed and discussed during the 8/30-31 Superintendents'Retreat. The areas addressed in these plans include:

- Superintendents'assurance that students will receive appropriate instructional supports and settings tailored to their individual needs
- Review of the teachers assigned to retainees
- Ongoing professional development and support for teachers of retained students as a cohort
- Use of proven, research-based instructional practices
- Use of assessment data to inform instruction
- Strategies for parent and family involvement
- Enhanced student support services
- Use of technology, where appropriate, to enrich instruction

B. **Eight Plus Program**
Eighth graders who did not meet promotion standards will be placed in the Eight Plus Program in September 2000. Each district is designing its own Eight Plus Program in keeping with the program design described below. District plans include shared instructional programs between Community School Districts and High School Superintendencies and Eight Plus Academies under the Alternative High School Superintendency. New resources have been dedicated to support reduced class sizes and increased student support services. The program design includes:

- Reduced class size of **15** to **20** students
- Individualized instructional programs for students
- Block programming in the subjects that determined student retention
- Assignment of appropriately licensed teachers
- Assignment of attendance teachers at a ratio of **1** to **200** students
- Assignment of guidance counselors at a ratio of **1** to **150** students

- Assignment of staff developers at a ratio of **1** to **10** teachers
- Standards-based projects incorporated into Science and Social Studies
- Mid-year assessments/articulation to high schools
- Maintenance of student portfolios in core subjects
- Computer based projects that develop research skills, internet access and integrate curriculum areas
- A parent involvement program whose components include:
  - Graduation Compact which parents and students sign. Details the reasons for the student's retention, the academic interventions to be offered and the conditions for student graduation.
  - Parent early warning notification system designed to alert parents to issues that may be impeding student achievement.
  - Increased Parent Teacher conferences to evaluate the success of the academic interventions being utilized.
  - Open houses, curriculum conferences and joint parent/student conferences focused on high school articulation and career choices.
- Assignment of district-based supervisor responsible for district-wide administration of the Eight Plus Program
- Assignment of school-based supervisor responsible for site specific administration of the Eight Plus Program

V. Staffing

The new contract for supervisors and administrators provided greater direct oversight of summer school by principals and assistant principals. In addition, a record number of teachers applied to work in Summer School 2000. As of August 11th, **24,774** teachers applied and a total of **15,457** teachers in grades K-12 were assigned; of these, **12,272** were certified. The Division of Human Resources (DHR) developed a multi-part recruitment plan targeted to reach the largest number of potential teachers and to provide an effective, efficient application and selection process. The most significant components of this plan were:

- System-wide Advertisements to current teachers
- Letters to all teachers on leaves of absence (other than medical leaves), on sabbaticals, and to all retirees
- Tri-state recruitment of New York State certified teachers
- Centrally organized posting for summer school positions
- On-line application process
- Eligibility for a two-year provisional New York State certificate to teachers who are certified in 39 other states

VI. Operational Support

A. **Facilities**

The Division of School Facilities worked closely with the School Construction Authority, the City's Department of Design and Construction and superintendents to identify priority locations within each district and to survey, scope, and schedule work. In some cases, districts were unable to use air-conditioned classrooms due to the decision to keep students in their home schools, building renovations and a lack of age-appropriate furniture. Where necessary, superintendents ordered fans for non air-conditioned spaces. Our air-conditioned capacity and use for this summer are presented below:

	New Installations:	Existing Rooms:	Non Air- Conditioned Classrooms in Use:
K-8	7,505	5,868	1,917
High Schools	370	2,298	1,439
SPED	77	1,271	96
Total	**7,952**	**9,437**	**3,452**

Over the course of the summer **298** instructional rooms in **143** schools experienced air conditioner outages. Most of these rooms were returned to service by the next day.

B. **Food Services and Transportation**

Food services and transportation for the summer session were provided in keeping with school year guidelines. Detailed information regarding these services was provided in previous reports to the Board on May 3rd and July 11th. The summer feeding program will continue at school sites until September 1st.

VII. Private Providers

In support of the promotion policy and the summer program, a Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued to identify organizations that could assist in implementing summer school services for students at risk of not being promoted in grades 3-12. Forty-six vendors were awarded contracts to provide professional development, programs to increase parental involvement, direct services to students, curriculum/instructional materials and test preparation for examinations.

Districts chose providers from this contract as well as from several existing contracts for professional services. An independent evaluation of Summer School 2000 is looking at the effect of private providers on student achievement.

VIII. New York City Teaching Fellows

The New York City Teaching Fellows program is a part of a continuum of recruitment initiatives we have developed to secure prospective teachers for the New York City public schools. Designed in collaboration with The New Teacher Project, a consulting arm of Teach For America, and the City University of New York (CUNY), the New York City Teaching Fellows aimed to attract high quality, non-traditional candidates. The scope of the program includes recruiting, selecting, training, and supporting candidates to become successful teachers. Fellows will be placed throughout the city in hard-to-staff and SURR schools.

Launched in mid-June, we successfully recruited over **2,300** candidates in one month. A rigorous screening, selection and final acceptance process resulted in **331** Fellows in this first cohort. They will be required to pass two State Certification exams, the Liberal Arts and Science Test and a Content Specialty Test, before beginning teaching assignments in SURR schools. The program design is consistent with new SED regulations and consists of the following elements:

- Participation in an intensive August training program to equip them with basic teaching competencies.
- Employment as a full time teacher in a SURR or high-need school beginning in September.
- Matriculation in an accelerated Masters Degree program that will be tailored for the fellows through the City University of New York. The Masters Degree will be completed in two years and is paid for by the Board of Education.
- Mentoring and support from the school, college and Fellowship network.
- Eligibility for a transitional certificate, a new credential created by the State, qualifying Fellows to teach in SURR schools.

IX. Summer in the City

As a part of the Governors Teachers of Tomorrow legislation, Summer in the City (SITC) was developed in collaboration with representatives from the Governors office, State University of New York, the City University of New York and the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities. SITC is also a part of the continuum of initiatives aimed at recruiting prospective teachers for the New York City public schools. In its first year, **245** students applied from **45** universities including SUNY campuses, Vassar, Cornell, Hunter, Lehman College, Brooklyn College, John Jay, Marymount Manhattan, Medgar Evers College and New York University. Final selection and acceptance resulted in **192** interns who were paired with a mentor teacher in mandated and enrichment summer school classrooms.

Districts participating in the first year included each High School Superintendency and Community School Districts 6, 7, 9, 16, 19, 23, and 28.

During the course of their seven-week internship, participants met the following program requirements:

- A minimum of 100 hours of in-class instructional time
- Eighteen hours of preparation time with a mentor teacher
- Six weekly meetings led by a master teacher
- Four days of professional development
- The design and delivery of two instructional activities

X. Break-aways

Break-aways has been growing steadily over the last three years. This year, **172** schools were partnered with **87** camps. Each camp had an average of two teachers overseeing the instructional component. We planned to serve **7,000** students this year. Some of the innovative new partnerships this year involve SUNY at Stonybrook, the National Audubon Society and the South Street Seaport Museum. To date, **6,775** students have participated in sleep-away and day camp programs. The implementation of the Promotion Policy has had an impact on the registration of students, which will be addressed next summer.

XI. Program Evaluation

Metis Associates, working in collaboration with New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy, was retained to provide an independent evaluation of all aspects of the summer program, with a special focus on the areas that have the most significant impact on student achievement. The evaluation design includes an assessment of program implementation, program outcomes, identification of best practices, and effectiveness of private services. An initial project report is scheduled for submission in mid October. An internal administrative review is looking at our management systems including the utilization of financial resources and the integrity of our current data systems.

XII. Conclusion

In the first full year of implementation of the Board's Promotion Policy, we were able to apply what we had learned from the previous summer program to scale up the quality and effectiveness of Summer School 2000. Considerable effort was given to developing management systems that would allow us to prepare for the summer program on a systemic level. Access to integrated, real-time, consistent data was created for instructional and operational systems including,

student promotion status, summer school registration, attendance, staffing, food services, transportation and facilities. Superintendents and District liaisons participated regularly in all planning stages. All of these efforts significantly improved the timeliness and quality of communication between central and the field. We will be looking closely at the evaluation conducted by Metis Associates to determine which practices had the most significant effect on student achievement in preparation for Summer School 2001.

Much work, however, remains to be done in terms of our communication with parents about the Promotion Policy. Parents need to know early on what is expected of their children grade by grade and parents need to understand the importance of their children attending summer school. Last year, a variety of strategies including parent-teacher conferences, mailings, distribution of *What Every Child Should Know* booklets, the website, and parent association/school leadership team meetings were used to inform parents. We must intensify our efforts this year. We will also petition the State to extend the Compulsory Education law to include summer school. This will give the school system the power to enforce a truancy policy so that more youngsters, who desperately need the increased learning time and additional support, may be compelled to come to school.

Our attention now turns to the school year where the quality of instruction and early intervention strategies are our highest priorities. We have raised our standards to a very demanding level, yet we are confident that every child can achieve those standards if given the right support and adequate instructional time.